

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4 and 6-15 remain pending in the application.

Allowed Claims 4, 6 and 9-15

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 4, 6 and 9-15 are allowed.

Informality in claims 7 and 8

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 7 and 8 have been carefully reviewed, and are amended herein to be more definite. Moreover, claims 7 and 8, being otherwise allowable, are amended herein to be in independent form.

It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 over Treyz in view of Vaisanen

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,526,335 to Treyz et al. ("Treyz") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,443 to Vaisanen ("Vaisanen"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner cites Treyz for allegedly teaching a piconet device that includes a GPS receiver, but agrees that Treyz fails to teach use of the password over the piconet. (Office Action at 2-3) The Examiner cites Vaisanen for allegedly teaching use of password encryption to increase security.

At best, Treyz and Vaisanen, even in combination, teach use of ENCRYPTION based on a password.

Claim 1 is amended significantly herein to recite an access prevention module to **prevent** the wireless device from communicating over a relevant wireless piconet network while the GPS receiver indicates a presence of said wireless piconet device within a secured area requiring a suitable password, and a password entry module to allow communication over the

relevant wireless piconet network to effectively override said access prevention module with entry of an authorized password.

Neither Vaisanen nor Treyz, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest ANY manipulation of access to a piconet based on a password, much less manipulation of access to a piconet based on information from a GPS receiver, and allowing access based on a password, as claimed by claim 1.

For these and other reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL: (202) 261-1020
FAX: (202) 887-0336